

05-713 NOV 23 2005

No. \_\_\_\_\_, OFFICE OF THE CLERK

**In the  
Supreme Court of the United States**

HARTCO ENGINEERING, INC.,

*Petitioner,*

v.

WANG'S INTERNATIONAL, INC., PILOT AUTOMOTIVE, INC.,  
PEP BOYS - MANNY, MOE & JACK, INC.,  
AND OVERTON'S, INC.

*Respondents.*

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit**

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

JACK M. ALLTMONT

*Counsel of Record*

SESSIONS, FISHMAN & NATHAN, LLP

201 ST. CHARLES AVENUE

SUITE 3500

NEW ORLEANS, LA 70170

(504) 582-1500

*Counsel for Petitioner*

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

(1) Will this Court allow the Federal Circuit to effectively supplant this Court's *Gorham* rule that:

[I]f, in the eye of an ordinary observer, giving such attention as a purchaser usually gives, two designs are substantially the same, if the resemblance is such as to deceive such an observer, inducing him to purchase one supposing it to be the other, the first one patented is infringed by the other.

with the Federal Circuit's own contrary rule that "design patent protection is very narrow"<sup>1</sup> and "design patents have almost no scope?"<sup>2</sup> *Gorham Mfg. Co. v. White*, 81 U.S. 511 at 528, 530 (1871).

(2) Should the verbal claim-construction procedure required in *Markman v. Westview Instruments*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996), for utility patents also be required for design patents where the sole claim is the "general [visual] appearance and effect"<sup>3</sup> shown in the patent drawings?

(3) Does the Federal Circuit's policy of reserving exclusively to itself the fact finding as to what constitutes substantial sameness in the eye of the ordinary observer violate plaintiff's Seventh Amendment right to trial by jury?

---

<sup>1</sup> *Hartco Engineering, Inc. v. Wang's International, Inc.*, 04-1480 et seq. (Fed. Cir. 7/25/05).

<sup>2</sup> *E.g., In Re Mann*, 861 F.2d 1581, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

<sup>3</sup> *Gorham* at 531.

### **RULE 14.1(b) STATEMENT**

A list of all parties to the proceeding in the Court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

*Plaintiff-Petitioner:* Hartco Engineering, Inc.

*Defendants-Respondents:* Wang's International, Inc.  
Pilot Automotive, Inc.  
The Pep Boys - Manny,  
Moe and Jack  
Overton's, Inc.

### **RULE 29.6 STATEMENT**

Petitioner, Hartco Engineering, Inc., is solely owned and operated by Carol and Cary Harwood. It has no parent corporation and no publicly-held company owns any of its stock.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED .....	i
RULE 14.1(b) STATEMENT .....	ii
RULE 29.6 STATEMENT ..	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	vi
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI .....	1
OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION .....	1
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOKED .....	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	3
A. Importance of the Issue Presented .....	3
B. Factual Background .....	4
C. The Litigation to Date .....	6
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	8
A. Summary of Argument .....	8

	<u>Page</u>
B. Federal Circuit Decisions Since 1988, Culminating With <u>Hartco v. Wang's</u> , Has Gutted the Meaningful Legal Protection That Congress and <u>Gorham Mfg. Co. v. White</u> Had Previously Afforded Design Patents. . . . .	9
C. The Federal Circuit Has Improperly Preempted the Jury in Design Patent Cases. . . . .	15
D. The Federal Circuit's Decision in <u>Hartco v. Wang's</u> Clearly Belies Any <u>Real</u> Adherence to the <u>Gorham</u> "Overall Appearance and Effect" Rule . . . . .	18
E. The Federal Circuit's Decision in This Case Violates Hartco's Right to a Trial by Jury . . . . .	21
CONCLUSION . . . . .	27
APPENDIX . . . . .	1a
A. Federal Circuit Judgment (8/29/05) Denying Rehearing . . . . .	1a
B. Federal Circuit Opinion (7/25/05) . . . . .	3a
C. Federal Circuit Judgment (7/25/05) . . . . .	16a
D. USDC, E.D. La. Minute Entry (7/13/04) Denying Post-Trial Motions . . . . .	18a
E. USDC, E.D. La. Judgment for Monetary Award (6/30/04) . . . . .	20a

F. USDC, E.D. La. Judgment for Injunctive Relief (6/25/04) . . . . .	22a
G. United States Patent Des. 401,194, issued 11/17/98 to Cary J. Harwood for automobile hitchcover . . . . .	26a
H. Color photographs . . . . .	35a
Hartco product in package . . . . .	36a
Wang's product in package . . . . .	37a
Hartco product front view . . . . .	38a
Wang's product front view . . . . .	39a
Hartco product side view . . . . .	40a
Wang's product side view . . . . .	41a
Hartco and Wang's products rear view . . . . .	42a
Hitch Buds product in package . . . . .	43a
Hitch Buds product side view . . . . .	44a

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page
<i>Alan Tracy, Inc. v. Trans Global Imports, Inc.</i> , 60 F.3d 840 (Fed. Cir. 1995) . . . . .	16
<i>Black &amp; Decker (U.S.) Inc. v. Pro-Tech Power Inc.</i> , 1998 WL 633636, 47 U.S. P.Q.2d 1843 (E.D. Va. 1998) . . . . .	16, 17
<i>Braun Inc. Dynamics Corp. of America</i> , 975 F.2d 815 (Fed. Cir. 1992) . . . . .	21, 25, 26, 27
<i>Brooks Furniture Manufacturing v. Dutailier International, Inc.</i> , 393 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2005) . . . . .	15
<i>Child Craft Industries, Inc. v. Simmons Juvenile Products Company</i> , 990 F. Supp. 638 (S.D. Ind. 1998, Bench Trial) . . . . .	16, 25
<i>Elmer v. ICC Fabricating, Inc.</i> , 67 F.3d 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1995) . . . . .	13, 14, 15, 21, 26
<i>Gorham Mfg. Co. v. White</i> , 81 U.S. 511 (1871) . . . . .	<i>passim</i>
<i>Graver Tank &amp; Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Products Co.</i> , 339 U.S. 605 (1950) . . . . .	10, 12, 24
<i>Hartco Engineering, Inc. v. Wang's International, Inc.</i> , 04-1480 <i>et seq.</i> (Fed. Cir. 7/25/05) . . . . .	i, 9, 15, 18

<i>Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v. Warner-Jenkinson Co.</i> , 62 F. 512 (Fed. Cir. 1995) . . . . .	21, 22, 24
<i>In Re Mann</i> , 861 F.2d 1581 (Fed. Cir. 1988) . . . . .	11, 12, 14, 15, 16
<i>Jacobellis v. Ohio</i> , 378 U.S. 184 (1964) . . . . .	15
<i>L.A. Gear, Inc. v. Thom McAn Shoe Company</i> , 988 F.2d 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1993) . . . . .	20
<i>Lawman Armor Corp. v. Master Lock Company</i> , 2004 WL 440177 (E.D. Pa., 2004) . . . . .	16
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996) . . . . .	i, 8, 12, 13, 14, 22
<i>Minka Lighting, Inc. v. Craftmade Int'l, Inc.</i> , 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 770 (Fed. Cir. unpubl. 2004) . . . . .	16
<i>OddzOn Products, Inc. v. Just Toys, Inc.</i> , 122 F.3d 1396 (Fed. Cir. 1997) . . . . .	16
<i>Street Flyers LLC v. Gen-X Sports, Inc.</i> , 2003 WL 21998960 (S.D.N.Y., 2003) . . . . .	16
<i>Tone Brothers, Inc. v. Sysco Corp.</i> , 28 F.3d 1192 (Fed. Cir. 1994) . . . . .	21
<i>Tropicana Products, Inc. v. Land O'Lakes, Inc.</i> , 286 F.Supp.2d 343 (D. Del 2003) . . . . .	16
<i>Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc. v. Hilton Davis Chemical Co.</i> , 520 U.S. 17 (1997) . . . . .	10, 12



<b>Constitution and Statutes</b>	<b>Page</b>
U.S. Const. amend. VII . . . . .	i, 2, 3, 8, 27
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) . . . . .	1
28 U.S.C. § 1338 . . . . .	1
35 U.S.C. § 171 . . . . .	2
35 U.S.C. § 281 . . . . .	1
37 C.F.R. § 1.153(a) . . . . .	2
<b>Other</b>	
Saidman, P. and A. Singh, <i>The Death of Gorham Mfg. Co. v. White: Killing It Softly with Markman</i> , 86 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 792 (2004) . . . .	14

## **PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Petitioner, Hartco Engineering, Inc. ("Hartco"), respectfully petitions for a writ of *certiorari* to review the judgment in this case of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

### **OPINIONS BELOW**

The opinion of the Court of Appeals (App. B) is reported at 142 Fed.Appx. 455 (Fed.Cir. Jul 25, 2005). The opinions of the District (App. E and F) are reported at 2004 WL 3403371 (E.D. La. 2004) and 2004 WL 3403370 (E.D. La. 2004).

### **JURISDICTION**

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered on July 25, 2005, and the Court of Appeals denied respondent's rehearing petition on August 29, 2005.

This Court's jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

The District Court was vested with original jurisdiction as to the patent infringement claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1338, 35 U.S.C. § 281.

## **CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOKED**

The Seventh Amendment of the United States Constitution provides:

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

35 U.S.C. § 171 provides:

Whoever invents any new, original and ornamental design for an article of manufacture may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The provisions of this title relating to patents for inventions shall apply to patents for designs, except as otherwise provided.

37 C.F.R. § 1.153(a) provides:

(a) The title of the design must designate the particular article. No description, other than a reference to the drawing, is ordinarily required. The claim shall be in formal terms to the ornamental design for the article (specifying name) as shown, or as shown and described. More than one claim is neither required nor permitted.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

### A. Importance of the Issue Presented

The Federal Circuit's decision herein conflicts with this Court's decision in *Gorham Mfg. Co. v. White*, *supra*, on an important question of federal patent law. Moreover, the Federal Circuit's decision in this and similar cases violates the Seventh Amendment right of trial by jury in design patent cases.

Design patents have been statutorily protected by United States law since 1842. In 1871, in *Gorham Mfg. Co. v. White*, this Court explained that the patent law protects designs against not only literal copying, but also against colorable imitations, *i.e.*, products which mimic the "general appearance of the [patented] design [but with] minor differences of detail [so that] the two design are substantially the same ... such as to deceive the [ordinary] observer, inducing him to purchase one supposing it to be the other."

Design patents are today extremely important items of intellectual property to tens of thousands of design patent holders.

Federal Circuit decisions culminating in the case at bar have virtually stripped design patents of the protection previously afforded by Congress and by this Court's *Gorham* decision. In effect, current Federal Circuit decisions and policy protect design patents only in the very rare case of literal infringement and allow piracy of design patents provided the copier makes a minor colorable change although that change is unnoticed and of no significance to the ordinary observer. This is absolutely contrary to the *Gorham* rule.